



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DATE OF LIBANIUS'S λόγος ἐπιτάφιος ἐπ' Ἰουλιανῷ.

BY J. W. H. WALDEN.

IN an article in *Hermes*,¹ 1892, E. v. Borries suggests that Libanius's λόγος ἐπιτάφιος ἐπ' Ἰουλιανῷ, though usually assigned to the year 368 or thereabouts, was delivered rather several years earlier, probably as early as 363. The source of the belief in a late date for the oration (368 or 369) is traceable to Sievers's *Das Leben des Libanius*, pp. 253, 203. As early as 1845, however (and of this v. Borries was apparently unaware), Clinton² put the date at 365, and considerably earlier than Clinton, Reiske in his edition of Libanius, 1791, says, referring to the λόγος ἐπιτάφιος (i. p. 620), 'certe non ante A. 365 exeuntem.' Perhaps it would not be necessary to raise the question again, after Clinton's assignment of the oration to 365, did there not seem to be danger of the Germans leading us astray on this point. There is, it would seem, really very little reason for putting the date as late as 368, and no reason at all for putting it as early as 363.

Sievers's prime mistake was in considering that Libanius's reference to the earthquake which followed the death of Julian must necessarily be to the earthquake of Oct. 11, 368, and not to that of July 21, 365. The passage in question reads as follows (i. p. 621): ἡ μὲν γε γῆ καλῶς τε ἤσθετο τοῦ πάθους, καὶ προσηκούσῃ κορυφῇ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐτίμησεν, ἀποσεισαμένη, καθάπερ ἵππος ἀναβάτην, πόλεις τόσας καὶ τόσας, ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ πολλὰς, τὰς Λιβύων ἀπάσας. κεῖνται μὲν αἱ μέγιστα Σικελίας, κεῖνται δὲ Ἑλλήνων, πλὴν μιᾶς, αἱ πᾶσαι, κεῖται δὲ ἡ καλὴ Νικαία, σείεται δὲ ἡ κάλλι μεγίστη, καὶ θαρρεῖν περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος οὐκ ἔχει. ταῦτα αὐτῷ παρὰ τῆς γῆς, ἣ, εἰ βούλει γε, τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος. If we glance at the passages (given by Clinton, i. pp. 464, 470-471) that refer to the two earthquakes in question, there can be little doubt left in our

¹ *Hermes*, xxvii. *Die Quellen zu den Feldzügen Julian's*, pp. 176, 196.

² *Fasti Romani*, i. p. 463.

mind that it is the effects of the earlier of the two that Libanius is here describing (unless, indeed, we except the single reference to Nicaea; see below). The earthquake of 365 was accompanied by a tidal wave and inundation, and was general; *per omnem orbis ambitum* . . . ; *concutitur omnis terreni stabilitas ponderis* (Ammian. 26, 10, 15-16), *per totum orbem facto* (Hieron.), καθ' ὅλης τῆς γῆς (Theoph. p. 47 D). Besides Sicily (Hieron.), Alexandria and the coast of Laconia receive special mention (Ammian. 26, 10, 19). Sicily and Greece, and perhaps Alexandria, are mentioned by Libanius. The earthquake of 368, on the other hand, was local, and though the shock was a severe one, so severe as utterly to destroy Nicaea, no place other than Nicaea is mentioned as having been affected. The only question apparently in connection with Libanius's reference to the earthquake is: Is the single reference to Nicaea enough to induce us to put the oration after the earthquake of 368 as well as after that of 365? It seems not. Nicaea must have suffered from the earlier earthquake, which was so general, and Libanius's words in reference to the other places affected do not suggest to us that they were written more than three years after the event. The terminus *post quem* of the oration, however, is July 21, 365.

Equally suggestive of an early date (cf. Clinton, i. p. 465) is Libanius's notice about the inroads of the barbarians that followed the death of Julian (i. p. 620): Σκύθαι δὲ καὶ Σαυρομάται καὶ Κελτοὶ καὶ πᾶν ὅσον βάρβαρον ἡγάπα ζῆν ἐν σπονδαῖς, αὖθις τὰ ξίφη θήξαντες ἐπιστρατεύουσι, διαπλέουσιν, ἀπειλοῦσι, δρώσι, διώκοντες αἰροῦσι, διωκόμενοι κρατοῦσιν, ὥσπερ οἰκέται πονηροὶ, δεσπότην τετελευτηκότος, ὄρφανοῖς ἐπανιστάμενοι. The same events are referred to by Ammianus and Zosimus. Ammian. 26, 4, 5, *hoc tempore velut per universum orbem Romanum bellicum canentibus bucinis excitae gentes saevissimae limites sibi proximos persultabant. Gallias Raetiasque simul Alamanni populabantur, Sarmatae Pannonias et Quadi, Picti, Saxonesque et Scotti et Atacotti Britannos aerumnis vexavere continuis, Austoriani Mauricaeque aliae gentes Africam solito acrius incursabant, Thracias et diripiebant praedatorii globi Gothorum. Persarum rex manus Armeniis iniectabat*. . . . Zos. 4, 3, 4, τῶν δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸν Πῆγον βαρβάρων, ἕως μὲν Ἰουλιανὸς περιῆν, τὸ Ῥωμαίων ὄνομα δεδιότων, ἀγαπώντων τε εἰ μηδεὶς αὐτοῖς κατὰ χώραν μένουσιν ἐνοχλοῖ, τῆς τούτου τελευτῆς ἀγγελεῖσθαι

ἀπανέστησαν αὐτίκα τῶν οἰκείων ἡθῶν καὶ πρὸς τὸν κατὰ Ῥωμαίων παρεσκευάζοντο πόλεμον. Cf. 4, 9, 1, τὸ γὰρ Γερμανικὸν ἅπαν, ὧν πεπόνθει κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐν οἷς Ἰουλιανὸς τὴν τοῦ Καίσαρος εἶχεν ἀρχὴν μεμνημένον, ἅμα τῷ γνῶναι τὴν αὐτοῦ τελευτὴν τὸ ταῖς αὐτῶν ψυχαῖς ἐμπεπηγὸς δέος ἀποσεισάμενοι καὶ τὸ φύσει προσπεφυκὸς αὐτοῖς θάρσος ἀναλαβόντες ὁμόσε πάντες τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείαν ἐπῆρσαν χωρίοις.

Ammianus's notice refers to the year 364, but that is an impossible date for the oration. The trouble continued, however, for a number of years after Julian's death, and it was not till June 366 (cf. Clinton, i. p. 466) that the Alamanni along the northern border were finally quieted. (Cf. Zos. 4, 9, 4, of this date, ἡ μὲν οὖν πρὸς τὸ Γερμανικὸν ἅπαν μάχῃ ταύτης ἔτυχε τότε τῆς τελευτῆς.) The Goths also proved troublesome in the years 365 and 366, for they assisted Procopius (Ammian. 27, 4, 1), who came to his death about the time of the defeat of the Alamanni in 366. The barbarians were, however, by no means quiet during the years that followed. The Alamanni surprised Moguntiacum in 368, and the Gothic war which followed the defeat of Procopius lasted through three campaigns, 367, 368, 369. Here again, therefore, as in the case of the previous notice, although Libanius's words would seem to point to a time as soon as possible after the death of Julian (between July 21, 365, the date of the earthquake, and June 366, the date of the first general repulse of the barbarians along the northern border after Julian's death), the possibility of a later date is not wholly excluded.

Sievers (p. 253) makes a point, however, of Hieronymus's notice for the year 368: *Libanius Antiochenus rhetor agnoscitur* (Mai, *Script. Vet.*).¹ It is no improbable supposition that for the year when Libanius 'flourished' Hieronymus selected the date of his best-known speech. This supposition, however, carries with it a consequence which Sievers did not anticipate, and which he would perhaps have hesitated to accept. If 368 is the date of the oration, it is the date of its publication, and not of its delivery. This appears from the following reasoning: Libanius informs us that the four years immediately preceding his 57th birthday was a period of continued indisposition owing to the vertigo (i. p. 96: καὶ ὁ κλύδων οὗτος ἔτη τέτταρα ἐπεκράτει . . .

¹ Sievers reads *insignis habetur* and assigns the notice to 369.

καὶ ἦν μὲν ἔτος ἑβδομον ἐπὶ τοῖς πενήκοντα λήγον ἡδῆ).¹ Libanius's 57th birthday was in July or August 371, as his 50th birthday was in July or August 364 (i. p. 94 : τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἦν μὲν 'Ολύμπια τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν · ἔτος δὲ ἐμοὶ πεντηκοστόν). During this period of four years, from the middle of 367 at the latest to the middle of 371, he was unable to declaim at all or to continue his instruction to his students unless lying in bed (i. p. 95 f. : ἐν ἦν ἐκείνοις μέτριον, ὅτι μήτε τοὺς λόγους μήτε τοὺς νέους ἐφεύγομεν. αὐτὸ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο οὖν ἡ παραψυχή, τὸ ὡς ἡδιστα περὶ ταῦτα πονεῖν, οἴκοι τε ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ σκίμματος ἐν τῷ διδασκαλείῳ . . . αἱ δ' ἐπιδείξεις ἐκποδῶν, ἀηδὴς δὲ φίλος προσίων). It is of course possible that the λόγος ἐπιτάφιος never *was* delivered, and indeed Riske seems to have had some doubt on this point, for he says, i. p. 620, 'si dicta unquam fuit.' The probabilities are, however, in favor of its delivery. In any case, a year or two one way or the other would hardly count for much in the Chronicon, for Hieronymus's reckoning is notoriously loose when it comes to details. (See Mommsen, '*Die Quellen der Chronik des Hieron.*' in *Abh. d. sächs. Gesell. d. W.* i. (1850) p. 684; Ritschl, *Parerga*, p. 623 ff.) However, it may be possible to account for the date 368. The exact date at which Libanius set up as a public teacher of rhetoric at Antioch is uncertain, but Sievers (p. 64, 12; 215 ff.) makes it out to be probably in the autumn of 354. Hieronymus completed his Chronicon in 380 (Migne, *P. L.* xxii. 44 f.). Taking these two dates as extremes, we should have the year 368 representing very nearly a point midway in Libanius's public career at Antioch. As such, it is one which we can readily believe Hieronymus would have selected as the year in which he 'flourished.' For similar methods of reckoning adopted by Hieronymus, see Ritschl's article in the *Parerga*, p. 623 ff. I notice also what seems to be a similar case in Hieronymus's remark on Basilius of Caesarea. Basilius entered the episcopate at Caesarea in 371; he died in 380. Hieronymus marks the year 376 thus : *Basilius Caesariensis episcopus Cappadociae clarus habetur*. Does this mean that Basilius published some work in 376 or does the date simply represent the middle point of his episcopate at

¹ κλύδων must, as Sievers says, p. 140, 36, refer to the trouble in the head, and not to the gout, which set in some years earlier.

Caesarea? The latter supposition is a possibility. The year 368 is also the point midway between the two dates which Libanius himself mentions in connection with his own age (364–371). Perhaps no conclusion can be drawn from a coincidence of this sort [though compare a similar case cited by Ritschl], but these latter dates may furnish a starting point for our reckoning. It is probably the case that, for most events contemporary with himself, Hieronymus depended not so much upon written accounts as upon verbal statements, records, and internal evidence. The pointedness of Libanius's reference to the earthquake and the inroads of the barbarians, combined with the inherent probability that the ἐπιτάφιος was actually delivered and not simply published, makes it likely that in Libanius's case at least the date of Hieronymus's notice, if we consider the year significant, is to be accounted for by some such reckoning as that suggested.

Further intimations in Libanius himself as to the date of the oration have not much significance. The famines and plagues which followed the death of Julian are referred to (i. p. 621), but the only notice in the chronicles referring to anything of the sort is Hieronymus's mention of a famine in Phrygia in 370. Clinton (i. p. 465) notices that the revolt of Procopius (365–366) is not mentioned by Libanius, and concludes therefrom either that the event was not yet known at Antioch or that the issue was still doubtful. It is to be presumed that Libanius would make mention in his oration of as many as possible of the miseries that followed the death of Julian, but still this argument, it must be admitted, is not conclusive for an early date. Libanius's reference to the indignities put upon those who had met with favor from Julian (i. p. 620) is thought by Sievers (p. 253) to be a possible reference to the indignities put upon Maximus by Valentinian (Eunap. *Max.* 102, 105), and is adduced as evidence of an earlier date for the oration than 375. If this argument has any force at all, the notice in Libanius points more nearly to the year 365 than to the year 368 or 369, for it was soon after the accession of the two emperors that Maximus was subjected to the treatment referred to. It is not at all clear, however, that the reference is so particular as is suggested by Sievers. Socrates (*H. E.* iii. 22; cf. Clinton, i. p. 465) puts the ἐπιτάφιος under Jovian's reign. Perhaps

this mistake signifies nothing more than that Socrates at least thought the oration early.

The question, then, stands thus : The terminus *post quem* of the λόγος ἐπιτάφιος is July 21, 365. All the evidence points to an early date for the oration, — to a time, we may say, between July 21, 365 and June 366. A later date is, however, not absolutely out of the question. But if we assign the speech to a time later than the summer of 367, such a date is the date of publication, and not the date of delivery.